

ament! small, I mean, in numbers and measure. It
WILBERFORCE—possessing a soul as large in its bal-
ance as the universe, and a mind that grasped the mighty
subject in the profound depth of its great principles;
in its bearings on the destinies of the race, whom
he so judiciously and so bravely advocated. He
he devoted his life. WILBERFORCE! A name, an au-
thority to pronounce, and which I never can pronounce
with the deepest veneration for his meek and gentle,
though dauntless courage and noble bearing in that great
cause.

WILBERFORCE moved for the first of the ten times
and then the abolition of the slave trade, he was denounc-
ed by the name of a hypocrite and a fanatic. I am not
given by name, on the floor of the House of Commons,
“hypocrite and fanatic”; but that he did not move him-
(Concluded on Fourth Page.)

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

EDITED BY G. BAILEY, JR.

CINCINNATI:

Tuesday Morning, April 21, 1840.

We have some excellent communications on hand which will be published next week—among them are letters from agents, a profound article on Theocratic slavery, and a letter from a correspondent in Tennessee, giving a most cheering report of the progress of Emancipation in the South.

Mr. Slade's Speech is finished this week. It occupies one more number than we intended. It is a noble effort. As for his Harrisonian remarks, they may go for what they are worth.

OUR ANNIVERSARY.—It is expected, that an effort will be made at our next Anniversary, to secure the support of Ohio abolitionists for the third party scheme. We hope all the sober, well-balanced friends of the cause will be largely represented.

If our lecturers can make it convenient to attend without too great expense, it is desirable that they should be present.

A large assortment of books has been ordered from New York, to be sent to Massillon; so that our friends will have an opportunity through their delegates of purchasing sets of books for libraries and depositories. We hope they will attend to this matter.

The following gentlemen will act as a Committee of Arrangements. Arvine Wales, Darius Ford, and Samuel Macey, of Kendall; O. N. Sage, George W. Warner, W. M. and R. H. Folger, Samuel Pease, Wm. Freed, H. Partridge, and J. O. Bloss, of Massillon.

MR. ADAMS.

We see the following extract from a letter, quoted in some political papers, which hitherto have been anti-slavery in their tone. They are quoted without comment, and we take it for granted, therefore, with approbation. One thing should never be forgotten, in estimating the worth of an opinion of Mr. Adams. Of great learning and genius, and much sagacity, he is distinguished, also, by some rare eccentricities.

“MR. ADAMS ON ABOLITION.”—The following are the concluding passages of a letter from Mr. Adams, concerning the action of voluntary societies, slavery, &c., to a gentleman in Brooklyn.

In Washington's Farewell Address to the People of the United States, he says, “All combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to erect, contract, or awe the regular deliberation of the constituted authorities, are destructive of the fundamental principle (that of popular government) and of fatal tendency.”

There is not in the farewell address one sentiment more valuable as admonition to his countrymen, than this. I have treasured it as a jewel; and one of the worst acts of Mr. Van Buren in my estimation, was in removing down this maxim of all embracing patriotism into a venomous and malignant denunciation of the anti-republican tendencies of associated wealth, as if the mischief of the associated power was confined to the action of the rich.

Since the day of Washington, I have been always on my guard against partial associations to control public measures. I have never been a member of any one of them—not even of a Temperance society.

Association to influence, direct and control the action of the government, is, however, the universal expedient of all parties, all interests and all opinions. We have them in numberless varieties and forms.

The Colonization society is one of them. A vast undertaking which originated entirely with the slaveholders, and by which the benevolence and humanity of the Northern States have been, and continue to be, egregiously duped. The colored colonies of Liberia, receiving their bread and constitution of sovereign and independent Republics, from the American Colonization Society, form the most extraordinary communities on the face of the earth.

The American Anti-Slavery Society, composed of men, not holding a single slave, undertaking to control and reason five millions of their fellow-citizens into the voluntary surrender of 12 hundred millions of their property, and commencing their discourse to the heart by proclaiming every holder of a man in bondage, a man stealer, doomed by the Mosaic law to be stoned to death, is also the eye of a rational observer a very curious show. Peter Pindar, leaving all his opinions with his patrons at the door,—but it would seem as if every man who enters into a political association, must have not only his own opinions but his common sense at the door.

I have never been permitted by the House of Representatives to give my opinions upon the abolition question generally, nor upon that of abolition in the District of Columbia. My struggle has been for the right of Petition—freedom of speech—freedom of debate—freedom of the Press. The South immediately proscribed me as an abolitionist. The abolitionists sent almost all their petitions to me—a large number of them because their own Representatives would not present them. I never gave the slightest countenance to their petitions for the immediate unaccompanied abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia or elsewhere—but the South thought and said I did, and their Lecturers and newspaper Editors were beginning to hold up their rod of political action, in terror, and to give intimations I must subscribe to their model, or take the consequences of incurring their high displeasure. I found it necessary therefore, to be perfectly explicit with them, and I was not allowed to do it in the House, I addressed to them the two letters which you will find here enclosed.

I was strongly invited by Mr. Leavitt and Mr. Stanton to attend the late National Anti-Slavery Convention at Albany; but declined for reasons which I assigned them in my answer.

If the total abolition of slavery, be in the purposes of Divine Providence, as I believe and fervently hope it is, other agents & other means will in its own due time be employed, than either the American Colonization or Abolition Societies. Or if these Societies or either of them are to be made instrumental in the accomplishment of the great work, they must entirely change their modes of operation and come down from the empyrean of their fancy to the vapory atmosphere of this mortal world.

I am with great respect, Dear Sir,

Your obt. servt.

J. Q. ADAMS.

Associated action finds its source and reason, in the feebleness of the individual, and his inability while standing alone, to protect himself against evil, or achieve any great good. The instincts of human nature and the necessities of our condition compel us to associate. There always will be minor combinations within the great association, termed civil society, for the accomplishment of objects, which civil government cannot reach. And there always will be partial associations for the control of government, so long as men's minds differ in their notions of the public good. The foundation of party is laid in this very fact. Like seeks like. Individuals who think alike will unite, and if their notions bear upon politics, they will act politically, in other words attempt to direct the action of the government, so as to carry out their principles. Other classes of individuals differing with these, have no alternative but to unite and act in the same way. To imagine it possible that men should live under a government, originating with themselves, and always act simply as individuals, without concert or mutual understanding, is to imagine an absurdity greater than that which Mr. Adams charges upon the American Anti-Slavery Society.

Seeing such societies are inevitable, the only question is, what association shall I join, or shall I start one after my own notion, or shall I simply act alone? Mr. Adams has chosen to act alone—and what has he done? Why, his individual action in the slavery question, if at all efficient, has been so, because it has fallen in with the action of that very association of which he speaks so lightly. Nay, had it not been for the efforts of that society, he, like the rest of the North, would now be slumbering over the insidious assaults of slavery on our institutions. What would his speeches have availed against Texas, had it not been for the concurrent, wide-spread and powerful efforts of the American Anti-Slavery Society? Had not the public mind been agitated by this body, his speeches, if delivered, would not have been read.

To bring the subject within a narrower compass. Bad men will always unite in support of an evil. If good men, after the pattern of Mr. Adams, choose to stand aloof, and alone, acting each one without concert, they may be as eloquent as Doctor Channing, or make the “empyrean” ring with their indignation, like John Quincy Adams, but they will never do any thing. Bad men will laugh them to scorn; the evil will grow upon them; and their only consolation will be, that they have not endangered government by creating an association to control its action! With all due deference to Mr. Adams' years, the advocate of ultra individualism, may undoubtedly retain his own opinions, but, if he does not leave common sense at the door, he turns her out of it. Associated evil action, can only be met by associated good action.

Mr. Adams, for more than a year past, has expressed no little contempt for the operations of the Abolition Societies. Like all our antagonists, he is apt at finding fault, but slow to propose a remedy. If every thing that has hitherto been done for the abolition of slavery be weak and ill-judged, will he do us the favor to point out a better way? He grants that the North is corrupt on the subject of slavery, ignorant of its designs and increasing power. What else can be done to remedy this, than to spread light on the subject, and endeavor by the press and the living voice, to awaken the ancient love of liberty in our countrymen, excite their fears, correct their judgment, inform their understanding, preach to their consciences, do all that facts, arguments and expostulation can do, to bring them to the right side? Has John Quincy Adams discovered a better way? Then let him reveal it to his country.

He will concede, that the legislation of the free States bears record of the deeply corrupting virus of slavery. We propose to reform this legislation, by persuading every man who has a vote, to cast it so that it shall tell against slavery, and in its results tend to blot out from our statute books, laws which transgress equality of rights, by proscription of color. Has he any thing to say against this? Has he discovered a better method of reaching the desired result? What mode of individualism, will substitute associated action in this case? Sarcasm is here out of place. Specify wherein we are wrong; till then, quotations from Peter Pindar, will be any thing but profitable.

Mr. Adams will admit that the church in the free States is wrong on the subject—too lenient by far, to slaveholding, too backward in bearing its testimony to the truth. We propose to reason the question with the church—to show, how her want of fidelity and christian boldness ministers to the support of the system of slavery. What else can we do in the matter? Have we left common sense at the door, here also? Will Mr. Adams enlighten our ignorance?

We might go on to particularize our modes of action in regard to Congress, but, we would ask Mr. Adams what can we do towards the South, that we have not done? We have addressed their fears and hopes, their interest, their magnanimity, their humanity, their love of glory, their reason. Access to them in every way we have sought, and neglected no opportunity of laying the truth before their minds. What more can be done? Can we legislate for them? Or, are we to wait and do nothing, until the wrath of God shall be revealed against them from Heaven, ridding the country at once by his thunderbolts, of the damning curse which has so long overshadowed it?

If we can gather any thing concerning his plan, it is to seek an amendment of the Constitution, whereby the whole subject may be disposed of. We, too, look for such a change. But, can this be effected without previous discussion—without this *coaxing and reasoning*, which he holds in so much contempt? The action of a single individual, we are to believe, startling the country for the first time, without any preliminary agitation of the subject, or movements calculated to press on the public mind the necessity of such action, is to be the great, the successful scheme for abolishing slavery! We also seek amendments of the Constitution, but we dwell too much in the “vapory atmosphere of this mortal world,” to see clearly how amendments are to be procured, without first preparing the public mind to recognize their necessity, and carry them into effect. If the true state of the case were understood, it would be seen, that abolitionists are the only men in the country that look at this great question practically, and treat it with common sense; while Mr. Adams and those who think with him, are the real star-gazers, and dwellers in the “empyrean of fancy.”

Shall we write? No. Shall we speak? No. Shall we invoke the testimony of the church? No. Shall we try the ballot-box? No. Shall we associate? No. Shall we do anything as individuals? No. What, then? Why, Providence, in due time, will use other means! Such, we suppose, is Mr. Adams' plan—a plan made up of negatives aided by a single, mystical hope. We leave it to candid men to say, whose plan is more suitable to the “vapory atmosphere of the mortal world”—that of the American Anti-Slavery Society, or that of Mr. Adams.

Mr. Adams is no part of an abolitionist. Standing as he does, famous for his assaults on slavery, and yet dealing his left-hand blows against abolition, he is too often a stumbling block in the way of the anti-slavery enterprise.

The truth is, no one can predict, when he rises to speak on any question connected with slavery, what course he will take—whether he will launch his thunderbolts against slavery, or aim his shafts at abolitionism. Compare with the extract of the letter we are now commenting on, the following paragraph, from a letter addressed by him to Messrs. Isaac L. Hodge, Seth Sprague, Jr. and E. Lieba Hobart, dated Oct. 27, 1838.

“Should the people of the Twelfth Congressional District of Massachusetts, again see fit to station me as their sentinel on the watch tower of the nation, they will not expect from me consent, acquiescence, or compromise, with the system of ANY OF ITS PARTS. Unyielding hostility against it is interwoven with every pulsation of my heart. Resistance against it, feeble and inefficient as the last accents of a failing voice may be, shall still be heard, while the power of utterance still remains, and shall never cease, till the pitcher shall be broken at the fountain, the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit unto God who gave it.”

Now, as in the case of Mr. Campbell, we do not say, that Mr. Adams absolutely contradicts himself, but we do say, that he breathes at different periods a very different spirit. We go one step further, and venture to doubt, whether even he himself can reconcile his “consent,” “acquiescence,” “compromise,” with slavery in the District of Columbia, a part manifestly of the great slave-system, with the implied affirmation in the above paragraph, that he would never consent to, acquiesce in or compromise “with the system, or any of its parts.”

The abilities of Mr. Adams are great. His zeal against slavery is honest and deep-seated. His reputation would not assail. But, when we think how sadly he has nullified his anti-slavery efforts by what we regard his inconsistencies, we cannot forbear applying to him the saying of the wise man.

“Dead flies cause the ointment of the apothecary to send forth a stinking savor; so doth a little folly, him that is in reputation for wisdom and honor.”

THE ALBANY NOMINATIONS.

The call for an Anti-Slavery Convention at Albany was circulated far and wide. It excited much feeling among abolitionists. Anti-slavery papers expressed diverse views with regard to its expediency; and it drew forth from the board of managers of one of the oldest anti-slavery societies in the country, a protest, well calculated from its spirit to increase rather than lessen attendance on the Convention. In view of these circumstances, we anticipated that it would be a very imposing meeting.

The first of April came, and with it one hundred and twenty-one delegates. After all that the Emancipator may say about bad roads, distressed money market, &c. &c., the congregation of but one hundred and twenty-one delegates, to discuss the question of a radical change in the policy of abolitionists, and the propriety of a third nomination for the Presidency of the United States, must be regarded as a failure.

Of these one hundred and twenty-one, seventy-five or nearly two-thirds, were from Troy and Albany! On the main question, regarding a separate nomination, 44 were absent, and the vote stood—year 44, nays 33.

Thus then a Convention of one hundred and twenty-one abolitionists, 104 of them from New York State, nearly two-thirds of them from Troy and Albany, decided, forty-four being absent, by a majority of eleven, to nominate candidates, for the Presidency and Vice Presidency! This decision was made in view of the fact, that several state societies had condemned the third party scheme, while not a single one had commended it; that the Executive Committee of the Parent Society had requested the editor of the Emancipator to desist from advocating the scheme in that paper; that the Liberator, Herald of Freedom, Charter Oak Voice of Freedom, Michigan Freeman, the Pennsylvania Freeman, the Christian Witness, and the Philanthropist, together with several political and religious anti-slavery papers, had discountenanced it, some of them in unqualified terms, others as premature, while but two papers had advocated it; and finally, that Mr. Birney himself had but recently declined a nomination, on the ground expressly that the minds of abolitionists were not yet ripe for the movement! Certainly these forty-four gentlemen had a perfect right to nominate whom they pleased, but we do not see how the fact that they have done so, ought to change the opinions of the dozen anti-slavery editors, the several State Societies, and the great majority of abolitionists, who have steadily disapproved of any such movement at the present time. We hope that Western abolitionists at least will take plenty of time to deliberate on the question of political action, without suffering themselves to be driven into any hasty measures by the premature action of a few persons at Albany.

In regard to the nominee for the Presidency, we may remark, that in point of ability and honesty we regard him as at least equal to either Mr. Van Buren or Gen. Harrison. Our friendship for Mr. Birney, and our high estimation of his judgment and capacity for government, make us regret that he should have been selected, as an *altar on which to sacrifice a few votes*. Mr. Birney has been called upon to suffer enough already. His friends ought not to have required this political suicide at his hands. A less useful and able man should have sufficed. They should have patiently waited for more favorable auspices, under which to bring forward such a man as Mr. Birney.

DEGENERACY.

The Ohio Confederate and Old School Republican—(OLD SCHOOL REPUBLICAN!) says, that “notwithstanding the thousand and one misrepresentations of General Harrison, there is not a politician in the Union whose views on the subject of slavery and abolition are more sound, as the people of the slave states estimate soundness, than his. Fortunately, this depends not on assertion, but on proofs abundant and conclusive as at hand.” Fortunately!! what good news now, thou consistent, sincere disciple of Old School Republicanism!—“Why I am able to prove abundantly and conclusively that General Harrison goes to the death for slavery, and against emancipation.” Such is the language of the Confederate rightly interpreted. General Harrison will hardly thank this enlightened old school Republican for his officious attempt to prove him a dishonest man. For the citizen of a free State, who can be proved in favor of slavery, is all this and more.

We cannot forbear calling the attention of reflecting men to two facts. In 1824, when a charge of friendship for slavery was brought against General Harrison, then a candidate for Congress, he repelled it, eagerly, indignantly, and explicitly. Now, in his own State, the effort is made to prove him by abundant and conclusive evidence, a friend to slavery, for the purpose of promoting his interests—

neither he, nor his friends show the slightest disposition to contradict it. Let reflecting men put these two facts together, and then tell us, whether they do not see strong evidence of the dreadful increase of pro-slavery spirit, and slaveholding power in our nation.

AN ADMONITION.

It is the right of individuals or of minorities in our association to propose new measures, to advocate them, and, in their own case, carry them into effect. No one denies this. We recognize no authority in any State-Society, or in the Parent Society, to call this right in question, or attempt by dogmatism or arbitrary edicts, to arrest its exercise. At the same time, we hold, that on all questions, particularly those of expediency, the opinions of the majority should be regarded with respectful deference. They are by no means conclusive, but they should weigh so far with a minority, as to restrain it from hastily attempting to execute what it regards, as expedient. If the Massachusetts Board of Managers were to blame for resorting to authoritative dictation, rather than to fraternal expostulation, the recent Albany Convention was no less in fault, in disregarding the expressed opinions of the great body of abolitionists. This Convention knew, that the large majority of their associates were opposed to a separate nomination. They knew that the project had been under discussion only a few months; and they conceded that it was a question of expediency. Why then did they not defer action, and prolong discussion. It certainly would have been nothing more than respectful, to have debated the matter a little longer. As it is, the forty-four gentlemen at Albany betray in their hasty decision, something approaching almost to contempt for the opinion of their brethren.

We understand that there are a few in our own State in favor of a third party. They are honest, we doubt not. Far be it from us to proscribe them. Let the question be fairly and fully discussed. Strong as has been the ground we have taken against the project, we shall not feel ourselves aggrieved, should all our friends become its supporters.—Whatever may be their ultimate decision, on this question, as it is a question of expediency, we shall not be pertinacious. For one, we abhor discord, and shall do nothing intentionally to produce it. But, let the few advocates of the new mode of political action do nothing rashly. Something will be attempted, we doubt not, at our anniversary. Let there be no precipitate commitment. If, in a few counties, our friends are prepared for separate political action, let them act accordingly. But, they know that Ohio abolitionists, generally, are opposed to such action. Let no general action of this kind therefore be attempted. The majority have no right to trespass on the citizen-rights of the minority. True. But, who made the minority a judge over the majority? Whence their prerogative to prescribe a mode of action for the whole body of abolitionists?

By deliberation, caution, mutual forbearance, the integrity of our organization in the west may be easily preserved, while we all ultimately shall attain the highest ground of political action. Such will not be the case, should the spirit which characterized one or two communications in our last paper, become general among us.

GENERAL HARRISON.

Certain questions were recently propounded to General Harrison, by the chairman and secretary of a meeting at Oswego, New York, on several subjects, among others, that of receiving and referring petitions for the abolition of slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia. The following is the reply of the committee of gentlemen who attend to the correspondence of General Harrison in such cases.

“CINCINNATI, Feb. 29, 1840.

GENTLEMEN,—Your letter of the 31st ult., addressed to General Harrison, has been placed in our possession with a view to early attention. This is unavoidable, in consequence of the very numerous letters daily received by the General, and to which his reply in person is rendered absolutely impracticable. As from his confidential committee, you will look upon this response; and if the policy observed by the committee should not meet with your approbation, you will attribute the error rather to ourselves and his immediate advisers, than Gen. Harrison. That policy is, that the General make no further declaration of his principles, for the public eye, whilst occupying his present position.

Such course has been adopted, not for purposes of concealment, nor to avoid all proper responsibility; but under the impression that the General's views, in regard to all the important and exciting questions of the day, have heretofore been given to the public, fully and explicitly, and that those views, whether connected with constitutional or other questions of very general interest, have undergone no change. The committee are strengthened in regard to the propriety of this policy; that no new issue be made to the public, from the consideration, that the national convention deemed it impolitic at the then crisis, to publish any general declaration of the views of the great opposition party and certainly the policy at the present, remains unaltered. In the meantime we cannot help expressing the hope, that our friends, every where, will receive the nomination of General Harrison, with something akin to generous confidence, when we reflect upon the distinguished intelligence of the nominating convention—how ably all interests were represented in that body; we certainly have a guaranty, that should Gen. Harrison be the successful candidate for the presidency, that office will be happily and constitutionally administered, and under the guidance of the same principles which directed our Washington, Jefferson and Madison. Believing you will concur with us in the propriety of the policy adopted, we have pleasure in subscribing ourselves,

Your friends,

DAVID WYNN,

J. C. WRIGHT,

O. M. SPENCER

H. E. Spencer, Cor. Sec.

P. S. The committee are now publishing in pamphlet form many of the former expressed opinions of the General, and facts and incidents connected with his past life, which will be forwarded to you at an early period.

The Emancipator complacently remarks—“We are sorry to be obliged to observe that the open avowal of this insult is perpetrated at Cincinnati. It could not be done at New York.” The “open avowal of this insult” was not “perpetrated” at Cincinnati, friend. It was “perpetrated” where the letter was published, at Oswego, New York. “It could be done” somewhere

else beside Cincinnati. Be above-board, none of your left handed compliments.

The pamphlet promised by the committee is now published. It contains General Harrison's letter in reply to the accusation of pro-slavery, published in 1822—and his notorious Vincennes speech. The necessary inference is, that the sentiments expressed in this speech concerning abolition and abolitionists, he still holds. In fact, the committee assure us, that the “General's” views in regard to all the important and exciting questions of the day, have heretofore been given to the public, fully and explicitly, and that those views, whether connected with constitutional or other questions of very general interest have undergone no change.” To show what those views are, they publish among other things, his Vincennes speech. If General Harrison be defeated, he certainly may thank his own folly, and that of his friends of the committee. Here we would fain stop; but honesty requires us, to publish every fact, that may throw light on the opinions of the General, in regard to slavery.—This, we have pledged ourselves to our readers, to do. The following is copied from the Emancipator.

“The Charleston Courier of March 12, contains an extract of a letter from Gen. Harrison, ‘dated a few days since, to a distinguished member of Congress from this State,’ (South Carolina,) in which the modern Cincinnati goes into an argument to show that his Vincennes speech was made after he was nominated and extensively regarded as a candidate for the presidency; and, as the Charleston editor says, ‘records his full and unqualified endorsement’ of that speech. The Charleston editor says, ‘it needed but a line to clear him’ from the suspicion of favoring the abolitionists, and ‘GENT LINE HAS BEEN GIVEN,’ and now ‘Gen. Harrison stands forth redeemed, regenerated and disenthralled,’ &c. &c.

Spirit of Independence! what folly to seek these among American politicians! We had thought that General Harrison was too independent a man to truckle to the slaveholder, but, with the rest of our public men, he has passed under the yoke.

Pained as we were with all this, what should next meet our eye but the following paragraph, in the Flemingsburg Kentuckian, of April 10th.

“ABOLITION.—The following is an extract from Gen. Combs' speech at the Harrison meeting in New Orleans:

“Last winter, Col. J. Speed Smith and Governor Morehead were sent as ministers from Kentucky to Ohio, with full power to adjust the difficulties between the two states relative to slavery. Gen. Harrison gave these gentlemen the strongest letters to his friends in the Legislature of Ohio, and was most urgent for a law to be passed to protect Kentucky against the abolitionists of his own state, and through his influence and that of his friends, the claims of Kentucky were acceded to and a law made to meet the case.—Here is a case of General Harrison's going right in the face of abolitionism in 1839. Can Mr. Van Buren give us one single act of his against abolition?”

“Thus have I shuddered the fire for fear of burning, and drenched me in the sea where I am drowning.”

We took it upon us some time ago to give a word of advice to the opposition party. There is certainly a very strong probability of their verifying the truth of the above couplet. One thing is certain, the friends of General Harrison either undervalue in toto the influence of abolitionists, or they take it for granted they are insincere and dishonest.

POLITICAL ACTION.

The Anniversary of the Mich. anti-slavery society was held at Pontiac, January 23d, 1840. The following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That we deprecate at present the organization of a political abolition party.

The following resolution was under discussion:

Resolved, That we will neither vote for, nor lend our influence to the election of any individual to any office of our government who is not known to be in favor of the immediate abolition of slavery, and we recommend this course to all the friends of the oppressed.

It was voted to strike out all after the word resolved, and insert the following:—

“That we will not lend our influence to the election of any individual to any office in our government, which confers a political influence on the subject of slavery, who is not known to be in favor of the immediate emancipation of the slave, and we recommend the system of interrogating the candidates for office, and pledge ourselves to support the nominees of either party otherwise qualified who are in favor of the cause of the oppressed.”

The amendment was lost by two votes. The question then was on the adoption of the original resolution, which after much discussion, was laid on the table till the next meeting of the state society.

We ought to have noticed the case related below, several weeks since. Read, and see the true spirit of slavery.

Dastardly Outrage.

Another mean and diabolical outrage is to be set down to the account of slavery. Mrs. Lucetta Mott, of Philadelphia, well known for her zeal in the cause, and highly acceptable, we believe, as a minister in the Society of Friends, was lately passing through Delaware on what is called among the Friends a religious visit, accompanied by the venerable Daniel Neill and his wife. None of them made address on the subject of slavery, and Mr. Neill did not speak at all. But the report went before them that they were abolitionists. After a public meeting at Smyrna, on Sunday afternoon, the following scene took place, which the Pennsylvania Freeman describes with a calmness altogether beyond what we can command in reading it. Let such facts well understand that the “meekness” of friend Neill is not very common, and is not likely to be made more so by such conduct as theirs.—*Mass. Abolitionist.*

“As Mrs. Mott, and her company, proceeded on their way from the meeting-house to the friend's where they lodged, Michael O'Brien, about two miles from Smyrna, a few harmless missiles were thrown at the carriage, but no other insult offered. At night, however, while they were seated under the pleasant and hospitable fireside of their friends, entertaining no suspicion of disturbance—a low fellow entered the house, and in a rude manner asked for Mr. Neill, saying that he was wanted at Smyrna, and that he had been sent for him. Upon being asked by friend Neill, what he was wanted for, and by whose authority he was sent, he replied, ‘to answer for your disorganizing doctrines,’ adding that he was sent by the most respectable people of Smyrna. Mr. Neill, treating him with all civility, but declined going that night, saying that though he held no disorganizing doctrines, and had taught no doctrines of any kind since he came into Delaware, he was willing to go to Smyrna in the morning, if his presence was wanted. But this would not satisfy the man. He must go at once. He was joined by others of the same stamp, only a little more bold, who demanded that he should accompany them forthwith. He attempted to reason with them, without effect. They would not be put off; he must walk along. He urged them, if they could force him away, to allow him to ride. He was an old man, he said, and not able to walk far; besides the roads were bad, and the night dark, and he could not accede to their demand. They seized him by force, he begged him from the arms of his afflicted and agonized wife, and after having taken him in this way some distance, compelled him, with a man at each side, holding his arms, to walk with them. He desired that his arms might be released, in order that he might help himself but this was denied him. He could get no ready, ‘if you are determined,’ says Mrs. Mott, ‘to perpetrate violence, let me be the subject of it.’ The person who has seized you know is innocent—he has done nothing—he has said nothing at which you can take offence. I am the offender, if any offence has been committed, and let me be the sufferer!’ But her appeals were of no avail. Neither were the more earnest and moving ones of his wife. They hurried him off to the place of their destination, where they consummated their deed of shame by flogging and feathering him, and riding him on a rail, after having thus satisfied their fiendish malignity, they set him loose, and allowed him to join his friends.

Friend Neill bore the indignity with his accustomed meekness, offering no resistance, evincing no fear, and manifesting a spirit which drew even from these fellows, evidence that they were half ashamed of their conduct. When he was set at liberty he turned to the mob, and, in his gentle manner, told them that if any of them should ever come to Philadelphia, and call at his house in Arch street, he would treat them in a manner very different from what they had treated him.”

BON. RICHARD M. JOHNSON.

What a progeny of monstrosities slavery is begetting on our republicanism. “Slavery is the corner-stone of republican institutions”—“in all communities, in an advanced stage of civilization the laborers must become the slaves, the property of the capitalists”—“slavery, more than any other cause tends to the promotion of pure morality and a high literature”—“woman is never so blessed as in a slave holding community”—“the right of petition is a right existing only under monarchies” &c. &c.

Thus it is that—

“One base deed with prolific power

“Like its cursed stock engenders more,

“The old injustice joys to breed

“Her young, incestuous with villainous deed.

The latest spawn of slavery, is a document from the courtly Vice President of the United States. Mr. Lewis Tappan transmits to this dignitary an abolition petition signed by one hundred and fifty ladies. Mr. R. M. Johnson, after the pattern of the immortal Peter Butler of Illinois, and more recently that of Senator Tappan, declines presenting it, and returns it to Mr. Tappan, with a rare letter, which we publish below.—With that delicate concern for the proprieties of the sex, which distinguishes slave holders and their sycophants, he devotes a portion of his letter to a dissertation on the sphere in which woman was designed to move. Now, however much some might be disposed to question the discriminating judgment of Mr. Johnson on matters pertaining to the gender sex, still, as the second officer in this glorious republic, his words certainly deserve notice. The ladies of monarchical England and France may be greatly edified by the discovery which this distinguished republican has made of certain noble traits belonging to woman, which have hitherto escaped attention. According to Vice President Johnson, “woman has, for instance, the right, not to vote; the right, not to serve on juries; the right, not to do battle; the right, not to participate in religious discussions; the right, not to act as a hangman; the right, not to petition a legislative body; the right—of retirement!” He scorns the idea of agitating ladies so much as to present their petitions.—“They are ‘ordained by nature, and by the customs of all civilized nations,’ he says, ‘to occupy a higher place in society than that of petitioners to a legislative body!’ Indeed they are so highly honored, as to have no right of petition at all.—Of course, this can be no grievance, when it is considered how many important rights, as just stated, they have to do nothing.”

To be serious, this new teacher of rights, in words of “glozing courtesy” denies to woman, the women of this country, the right of petition—not as exercised on the subject of slavery alone—but in its broadest significance. This is not strange. Men, who are accustomed to see woman's delicate form writhing beneath the lash,—how can they believe that she is endowed with any right? Those who live by the murder of right, of course are not to be supposed to know the meaning of the term.

We are becoming impatient of the vain babbling of these slave holders. It is almost a waste of time to chronicle their absurdities. To argue with them any longer is out of the question. The people of the free states compared with them are two to one; they have the power; they must be reformed, and Congress filled with such men as will trample under foot these miserable, insulting dogmas of slave holding republicanism.

One thing more, before we take leave of the Vice President. The question of slavery in the District of Columbia, he says, was settled by the constitutions of Maryland and Virginia, and by the Federal Constitution. The right of Congress to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, does not mean omnipotent legislation. It is, almost needless to say, that this gentleman, like Senator Tappan, has also turned a somersault,—a kind of sport to which our great—we beg pardon, we mean our public—men are much addicted. On the 1st of February 1820, during the debate on the Missouri question, Richard M. Johnson said—

“In the District of Columbia containing a population of 30000 souls, and probably as many slaves as the whole territory of Missouri, the power of providing for their emancipation rests with Congress alone. Why then this heart-rending sympathy for the slaves of Missouri, and this cold insensibility, this eternal apathy towards the slaves in the District of Columbia?”

March 1840, he denies the power to Congress. Has Richard M. Johnson changed his opinions? No. Circumstances have changed his words;—that is all.

Abolition Petitions.

A letter from the VICE PRESIDENT to LEWIS TAPPAN, of New York, upon declining to present to the Senate an Abolition Petition, signed by one hundred and forty women.

Washington, March 23, 1840.

SIR.—Your letter of the 7th inst. was duly received, enclosing a petition to Congress, signed by one hundred and forty women of the city and county of New York, praying for the abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and in those Territories of the United States where they exist, and to admit no new slave States into the Union, requesting me to lay the same before the Senate. I have also received your letter of the 17th inst., requesting me to inform you when I would present the petition. Having declined to present the petition, it is, perhaps, due to the fair petitioners, and to you, their organ, as well as to myself, to state some of the reasons which dictate my course.

The constitutional right of petition is contained in the first article of amendment, as follows:—“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

By the packet ship *South American*, Sept. 10, 1855, we have received intelligence from England to the 20th ult., from Liverpool, and 19th from London.

England has now declared war against China—
—Lord Auckland has received instructions to that effect.

FROM FLORIDA.—The Tallahassee information of the 28th March, furnishes the following information:

To this, we add the subjoined paragraph from the Baltimore Patriot of Wednesday, April 18, 1861:

The steamer General Clinch, Captain Brooks, arrived at Charleston on Sunday, from Gary's Ferry, Black Creek, (Florida), arriving on board as passengers, Captain F. Seale, Assistant Quarter Master, Drs. J. B. Wells and S. R. Arnold, all of the United States Army; also two Hospital Nurses.

We learn that Col. Twigg had returned from a fifteen day's scout up the St. John's River, with the Blood Hounds, which, it is stated, were found to be perfectly useless—all attempts to induce them to take the trail of the Indians proving unsuccessful.

Two Indians were discovered in a boat, and shot—one of them is said to be a brother of Sam Jones.

THE WIDOW AND THE FATHERLESS.—The Legislature of New York has just enacted a very excellent law, concerning insurances on life, for the benefit of Married Women. It provides that any married woman may, by herself and in her name, or in the name of any third person, with his assent, or as her trustee, cause to be insured, for her sole use, the life of her husband for any definite period, or for the term of his natural life; and in case of her surviving her husband, the sum or net amount of the insurance becoming due and payable, by the terms of the insurance, shall be payable to her, to and for her own use, free from the claims of the representatives of her husband, or of any of his creditors; such exemption not to apply where the amount of premium annually paid shall exceed three hundred dollars.

This is the *poor woman's law*; and hers exclusively; for it is further provided, that in case of the death of a wife who has so insured, before that of

"We published yesterday, an act recently passed by the Legislature of this State, and ratified by the Governor, which, although very brief, *deserves* to be ranked among the most beneficial and honorable of all recorded in the statute book. It authorizes insurance of lives for the benefit of widows and orphans; and we take occasion of its passage to speak once more in favor of the duty—for so every one ought to consider it—of making this a really fitting welfare of those whom in life it is a rightly feeling man's pleasure to sustain and cherish, but who, when dying, leaving helpless, comfortless and destitute. By the annual payment of a few dollars, the children, or the wife, or the husband, come into the full use of the amount of the insurance. Upon this most excellent law, the New York Commercial Advertiser remarks as follows:—*Cincinnati Gazette.*

have, merely by abstinence from luxuries, the life insurance affords protection against what for these whom the dying husband and father leaves behind. It is a protection which every husband and father ought to establish; but most especially they whose labor only suffices to procure the daily or weekly means of subsistence for their families. Life insurance is a specially beneficent invention for the poor man—for the wealthy it is a convenience, but for the poor it is a blessing; and the first object of economy should be the saving of enough to pay the insurance premium."

ANTI-SLAVERY NOTICE.

THE CINCINNATI ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY will meet at the Office of the Philanthropist on next Wednesday afternoon, (April 22,) at 5 o'clock, for the election of officers for said Society.

EDWARD B. HOWELLS,

Secretary.

Cincinnati, April 21, 1840.

RECEIPTS.

FELLOWSHIP AND DONATIONS.

Continued from page 128: 16 April 11th, 1840.
 Stark Co., A. S. Sledge, 4/00; Friends in Louisville, Ky., 10, 00; Mr. Kellogg, Cincinnati Soc., on pledge, 4.50; E. Gage, do., do., 5.00; A Friend, 20.00; Ross Co. A. S., Sledge, per Rev. H. S. Fullerton, 10.00; Mr. Brewster, on pledge, 5.00; R. Bogue 5.00.

Wm. Donaldson, Treasurer.

FOR PHILANTHROPIST.

From March 12th, 1840, to April 11th, 1840.
 Champenon and Parker 3.00; R. Peters 2.00; Joseph Taylor 2.00; Geo. W. Warner 1.00; Samuel Stephenson 7.50; John H. Miller 3.00; William Moorman 2.00; Eliza Jones 2.50; Robert Porter 2.50; Doctor J. G. Rogers 2.50; James Fobes 3.00; Alanson Cole 2.50; Sylvester Merian 5.00; Stark Co. A. S. Sledge, 10.00; William H. Overman 2.50; Bailey Pearson 2.50; Benjamin Knapp 2.50; Thomas J. Hays 2.50; Isaac Reynolds 2.50; John D. Hazen 5.00; Maria Sprague 12.50; Thomas J. Hurlburt 4.00; William H. Shaw 5.00; Nathan Winslow 2.50; Samuel Fessenden 2.50, George

Joseph 2.50; James Appleton 2.50; Andrew McMillan 2.50;
 Jessup 5.00; James Cist; Hugh J. Needham 3.00; William
 R. Bales 2.50; Robert F. Hibbitts 2.50; John McKim 2.50;
 2.50; Robert Beatty 5.00; Christopher Robinson 5.00;
 J. Thomas 2.50; J. Hixit 2.50; Moses Hough 2.50; C. B.
 Tuttle 2.50; John Dixon, per L. D. Butts, 2.50; Oliver
 C. Snow, C. A. Snowell 3.00; Lot Preston 2.00; John Lane
 3.00; James & Pamela 2.50; John Wright 2.50; R. Penn
 2.50; Cooper & Taylor 2.50; Mrs. A. G. Clark 2.50; R.
 Baldwin 2.50; L. Phineas Pixley 2.50; E. Shreve 2.50; R.
 & Bassett 1.75; Bridges Pixley 2.50; E. G. Shreve 2.50;
 G. Perry 2.50; J. S. Reed 3.00; R. Harris 2.50; J. Burr 2.
 H. Shedd 2.50; A. Whitfield 5.00; A. Gettings 2.50;
 Rev. 2.50; H. P. Dearson 2.50; J. W. Bosworth 2.
 3.00; James & Daniel 2.50; Curtis 2.50; C. Ward 2.50;
 H. Cable 3.00; John Stone 2.50; J. F. Forghy 1.25; Samuel
 Rev. Stewart 2.50; Rev. J. W. Taylor 2.50; J. C. Bennett
 2.50; Crothers 5.00; John D. Evans 2.50; P. B. Evans 2.50;
 John Porter 2.50; Charles Porter 2.50; J. A. Coone 2.50;
 George Grave 2.00; C. A. Berrier 2.50; Kingsbury Weid
 2.50; John Galtie; Wasson and Anderson 1.25; John
 Lawson 2.00; J. W. Taylor 1.50; Rev. Scott & Mans
 2.50; Amos Clark 2.50; J. W. Taylor 1.50; Moses
 Wilder 2.00; William Carnes 1.25; James McIntosh 2.50;
 William Burnett 5.00; Jonas & Isaac Pettijohn 2.50; Samuel
 Marks 2.00; James Buck 1.00; Alexander Owen 3.50; Eli
 R. Day 2.00; Walter D. Jay 2.50; L. J. Merwin 3.00;
 J. W. Taylor 2.50; Julius Lemayne 2.50; Henry
 Langley 2.50; S. Rickard 2.50; F. Stone 2.50; T.
 Stevenson 1.00; William B. Jarvis, Jr. 2.50;
 Wm. Dearborn, *Per. Acct.*

Prices of Produce at the Canal.	
CINCINNATI, April 20, 1840.	
Flour, (from boats)	\$ 3 00
Wheat, per bushel,	40 to 50
Corn Meal,	31

